

A quantitative Carleman estimate for second order elliptic operators

Ivica Nakić¹, Christian Rose², and Martin Tautenhahn²

¹*University of Zagreb, Department of Mathematics, Croatia*

²*Technische Universität Chemnitz, Fakultät für Mathematik, Germany*

We prove a Carleman estimate for elliptic second order partial differential expressions with Lipschitz continuous coefficients. The Carleman estimate is valid for any complex-valued function $u \in W^{2,2}$ with support in a punctured ball of arbitrary radius. The novelty of this Carleman estimate is that we establish an explicit dependence to the Lipschitz and ellipticity constants, the dimension of the space and the radius of the ball. In particular we provide a uniform and quantitative bound on the weight function for a class of elliptic operators given explicitly in terms of ellipticity and Lipschitz constant.

1. Introduction

Carleman estimates were first introduced by Carleman [Car39] in 1939 in order to establish a unique continuation property for elliptic operators L with non-analytic coefficients, i.e. if the solution u of $Lu = 0$ in $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ vanishes in a non-empty open set, then u is identically zero. While Carleman's original result applies to the case $d = 2$ and $L = -\Delta + V$ with $V \in L^\infty_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, by now there is a wealth of results pertaining to Carleman estimates and its application to unique continuation, see, e.g., [Hör89]. In particular, notable attention has been paid to the case $V \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, since this can be used to show that the Schrödinger operator $H = -\Delta + V$ with potential $V \in L^p_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ has no positive eigenvalues, see [JK85] and the references therein. Further applications of Carleman estimates are, for example, uniqueness properties of solutions of Schrödinger equations [KPV03, IK06, EKP12], uniqueness and stability of inverse problems [Kli13, Kli15], or control theory of partial differential equations [FI96, CZ01, Rou12, RL12].

So far, all the mentioned applications of Carleman estimates concern qualitative statements. For its proofs, the particular dependence on the parameters is not essential. Certainly, there are plenty of applications which require some knowledge on the dependence on the parameters entering in the Carleman estimate. For this purpose, we cite the following Carleman estimate by Escauriaza and Vessella [EV03], see also [KSU11]. Let $L = -\text{div}(A\nabla)$ be elliptic with Lipschitz continuous coefficients and denote the corresponding constants by ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 , respectively. Then there exist $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ and $C, \Xi, \alpha_0 \geq 1$, depending on ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 , and a function $w : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $|x|/\Xi \leq w(x) \leq \Xi|x|$, such that for all real-valued $u \in C^\infty_c(B_\kappa \setminus \{0\})$ and all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ we have

$$\alpha \int w^{1-2\alpha} |\nabla u|^2 + \alpha^3 \int w^{-1-2\alpha} u^2 \leq C \int w^{2-2\alpha} (Lu)^2. \quad (1)$$

Here, B_κ denotes the open ball with radius κ and center zero.

The exceptional feature of this Carleman estimate is that the second term on the left hand side goes with α^3 and the particular powers of the weight function. Thanks to this, Bourgain and Kenig [BK05] were able to apply (a refined version of) this Carleman estimate to prove that if $\Delta u = Vu$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$, $u(0) = 1$, $|u| \leq C$ and $|V| \leq C$, then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $|x| > 1$

$$\max_{|y-x| \leq 1} |u(y)| > c \cdot \exp\left(-c'(\log|x|)|x|^{4/3}\right). \quad (2)$$

Let us note that the quantitative unique continuation principle in Ineq. (2) was crucial for the answer to a long-standing problem in the theory of random Schrödinger operators, namely Anderson localization for the continuum Anderson model with Bernoulli-distributed coupling constants. Moreover, if the precise decay rate $4/3$ in Ineq. (2), which results from the particular form of Ineq. (1), would be replaced by 1.35 , one could not conclude localization for the continuum Anderson-Bernoulli model using the same techniques, cf. [BK05, p. 412]. Ineq. (2) was also used to prove bounds on the density of states measure for Schrödinger operators in dimension $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, a restriction which stems from the specific parameters in Ineq. (2).

Another example where the Carleman estimate (1) proved to be useful is so-called scale-free and quantitative unique continuation. In [RMV13], the authors prove that if $|\Delta u| \leq |Vu|$ in $\Lambda_L = (-L/2, L/2)^d$, then for all $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ one has

$$\left(\frac{\delta}{C}\right)^{C+C\|V\|_\infty^{2/3}} \|u\|_{L^2(\Lambda_L)}^2 \leq \|u\|_{L^2(W_\delta(L))}^2, \quad (3)$$

where $C = C(d)$ and $W_\delta(L)$ is some union of equidistributed δ -balls in Λ_L . The notion scale-free and quantitative refers to the fact that C is independent of L and the dependence on δ is known to be polynomial. The latter fact holds due to the bounds on the weight function given above and is essential for their application to random Schrödinger operators.

The mentioned applications so far concerned Schrödinger operators only. In this case, the (abstract) constants κ and Ξ in Ineq. (1) depend only on the dimension. Due to the method of proof in [BK05, BK13, RMV13], a precise knowledge of κ and Ξ would change only dimension-dependent constants like c , c' and C . However, if one, for example, pursues to prove an analogue of Ineq. (3) for solutions of $|Lu| \leq |Vu|$ with L as above, one encounters dependencies of the constants κ and Ξ on the ellipticity and Lipschitz parameters of L . If we have no quantitative bounds on these dependencies, the use of Carleman estimate (1) might not be feasible, cf. Remark 2.4 for details. Such problems have already been discussed in the recent proceedings [BTV14] and [BNR⁺15] on quantitative scale-free unique continuation principles for elliptic operators. This strongly suggests that a refinement of the Carleman estimate (1) with explicit bounds on κ and Ξ is a worthwhile goal.

In this note we give a precise refinement of the Carleman estimate (1) in the sense that

- (i) the estimate is valid on the whole punctured unit ball (i.e. $\kappa = 1$), and
- (ii) all the constants, including the bound Ξ on the weight function, are explicitly calculated in terms of ellipticity and Lipschitz constant.

Our proof is based on techniques developed in [EV03, BK05]. Compared to the Carleman estimates of [EV03] and [BK05], our result holds with $\kappa = 1$ and additional gradient term in the lower bound at the same time. Let us emphasize that, beside the quantitative control on all the parameters, even this involves non-trivial modifications of the existing proofs, cf. Section 4.

The usefulness of the established quantitative bounds has been shown by the proof of an analogous result to Ineq. (3) for an explicitly given class of elliptic operators, see [BTV15] and Remark 2.4.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state the main result of the paper. In Section 3 we provide preparatory estimates and identities needed for the proof of the main result. In Section 4 we give the proof of the main result, while the proofs of two technical lemmata are postponed to the appendix.

2. Main result

Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and L be the second order partial differential expression

$$Lu := -\operatorname{div}(A\nabla u) + b^T \nabla u + cu = -\sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i (a^{ij} \partial_j u) + \sum_{i,j=1}^d b_i \partial_i u + cu, \quad (4)$$

acting on complex-valued functions on $\mathbb{R}^d$, where $A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ with $A = (a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$, $b : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^d$, $c : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, and ∂_i denotes the i -th weak derivative. Moreover, we denote by $B_\rho \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ the open ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with radius $\rho > 0$ and center zero, by $|z|$ the Euclidean norm of $z \in \mathbb{C}^d$, and by $\|M\|_\infty$, $\|M\|_1$ and $\|M\|$ the row sum, column sum and spectral norm of a matrix $M \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$. For the coefficient functions A , b and c we introduce the following assumption.

Assumption. Let $\rho > 0$, $\vartheta_1 \geq 1$ and $\vartheta_2 \geq 0$. We say that $\mathcal{A}(\rho, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ is satisfied if and only if $b, c \in L^\infty(B_\rho)$, $a^{ij} = a^{ji}$ for all $i, j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ and for almost all $x, y \in B_\rho$ and all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\vartheta_1^{-1} |\xi|^2 \leq \xi^T A(x) \xi \leq \vartheta_1 |\xi|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|A(x) - A(y)\|_\infty \leq \vartheta_2 |x - y|. \quad (5)$$

By Rademacher's theorem [Fed96], if $\mathcal{A}(\rho, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ is satisfied, then the coefficients a^{ij} are differentiable almost everywhere on B_ρ and the absolute value of the derivative is bounded by ϑ_2 . Operators L for which the lower bound of the first inequality in (5) is satisfied are called elliptic. Elliptic means therefore, that for almost every point $x \in B_\rho$ the symmetric $d \times d$ matrix A is positive definite. A simple example is $A = I$. In this case the operator L coincides with the negative Laplacian. We use the notation $A_0 = A(0)$.

For $\mu, \rho > 0$ we introduce the function $w_{\rho, \mu} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ by

$$w_{\rho, \mu}(x) := \varphi(\sigma(x/\rho)),$$

where $\sigma : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and $\varphi : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ are given by

$$\sigma(x) := (x^T A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi(r) := r \exp \left(- \int_0^r \frac{1 - e^{-\mu t}}{t} dt \right).$$

The function φ obeys the upper bound $\varphi(r) \leq r$. For a lower bound we distinguish two cases. If $\sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu \leq 1$ we use the lower bound $\varphi(r) \geq re^{-\mu r}$. If $\sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu \geq 1$ distinguish two subcases. If $r \leq 1/\mu$ we use $1 - e^{-\mu t} \leq \mu t$ and obtain $\varphi(r) \geq re^{-\mu r} \geq r(e\sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu)^{-1}$. If $r > 1/\mu$ we split the integral according to the two components $[0, 1/\mu]$ and $[1/\mu, r]$. On the first component we use $1 - e^{-\mu t} \leq \mu t$, on the second one $1 - e^{-\mu t} \leq 1$. This way we obtain $\varphi(r) \geq 1/(e\mu)$ if $r > 1/\mu$. Putting everything together we obtain for all $r \in [0, \sqrt{\vartheta_1}]$

$$\varphi(r) \geq \frac{r}{\mu_1}, \quad \text{where} \quad \mu_1 = \begin{cases} e\sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu & \text{if } \sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu \leq 1, \\ e\sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu & \text{if } \sqrt{\vartheta_1}\mu \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

For the weight function $w_{\rho,\mu}$ there follows

$$\forall x \in B_\rho: \quad \frac{\vartheta_1^{-1/2}|x|}{\rho\mu_1} \leq \frac{\sigma(x)}{\rho\mu_1} \leq w_{\rho,\mu}(x) \leq \frac{\sigma(x)}{\rho} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}|x|}{\rho}.$$

Keep in mind that we will drop the index of the weight function in Section 3 and onwards, and write w instead of $w_{\rho,\mu}$. Our main result is the following Carleman estimate.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\rho > 0$, $\vartheta_1 \geq 1$, $\vartheta_2 \geq 0$, Assumption $\mathcal{A}(\rho, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ be satisfied and*

$$\mu > 33d\vartheta_1^{11/2}\vartheta_2\rho.$$

Then there exist constants $\alpha_0 = \alpha_0(d, \rho, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \mu, \|b\|_\infty, \|c\|_\infty)$, $C = C(d, \vartheta_1, \rho\vartheta_2, \mu) > 0$, such that for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and all $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support in $B_\rho \setminus \{0\}$ we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (\alpha\rho^2 w_{\rho,\mu}^{1-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \overline{\nabla u} + \alpha^3 w_{\rho,\mu}^{-1-2\alpha} |u|^2) dx \leq C\rho^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_{\rho,\mu}^{2-2\alpha} |Lu|^2 dx. \quad (6)$$

The constants α_0 and C are given in Eq. (28).

Remark 2.2. In the case where b and c are identically zero, the conclusion of Theorem 2.1 holds with $C = \tilde{C}$ and $\alpha_0 = \tilde{\alpha}_0$ where $\tilde{C}$ and $\tilde{\alpha}_0$ are given in Eq. (26). A straightforward calculation shows that they obey the upper bounds

$$\tilde{C} \leq 2d^2\vartheta_1^8 e^{4\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \mu_1^4 (3\mu^2 + (9\rho\vartheta_2 + 3)\mu + 1) C_\mu^{-1}$$

and

$$\tilde{\alpha}_0 \leq 11d^4\vartheta_1^{33/2} e^{6\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \mu_1^6 (3\rho\vartheta_2 + \mu + 1)^2 (1 + \mu(\mu + 1)C_\mu^{-1})$$

where $C_\mu = \mu - 33d\vartheta_1^{11/2}\vartheta_2\rho$. In the general case where $b, c \in L^\infty(B_\rho)$ the conclusion of the theorem holds with

$$C = 6\tilde{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_0 = \max \left\{ \tilde{\alpha}_0, C\rho^2 \|b\|_\infty^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2}, C^{1/3} \rho^{4/3} \|c\|_\infty^{2/3} \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \right\},$$

cf. Eq. (28). We observe that if $\vartheta_2 \neq 0$, then both upper bounds of C and α_0 tend to infinity if μ tends to $33d\vartheta_1^{11/2}\vartheta_2\rho$. If $\vartheta_2 = 0$ the upper bound of $\tilde{\alpha}_0$ is uniformly bounded for all $\mu > 0$. In the case of the pure negative Laplacian, i.e. $A \equiv \text{Id}$ and $b, c \equiv 0$, we have $\vartheta_1 = 1$ and $\vartheta_2 = 0$. In this case we note that our Carleman estimate is valid for arbitrary $\mu > 0$. For example, in the case $\mu = 1$ we infer from the proof of Theorem 2.1 (not using the above estimates) that $C \leq 8e^8 d^2$ and $\alpha_0 \leq 18e^{12} d^4$.

Remark 2.3. Our result gives rise to a uniform Carleman estimate for a certain class of elliptic operators given precisely in terms of ellipticity and Lipschitz constants. More precisely, fix $\hat{\vartheta}_1 \geq 1$ and $\hat{\vartheta}_2, \hat{b}, \hat{c} > 0$, $\rho > 0$ and denote by $\mathcal{L}$ the class of elliptic operators of the form (4) for which

- (i) the ellipticity and Lipschitz constant on B_ρ are bounded by $\hat{\vartheta}_1$ and $\hat{\vartheta}_2$, and
- (ii) the coefficient functions b and c satisfy $\|b\|_\infty \leq \hat{b}$ and $\|c\|_\infty \leq \hat{c}$.

Then, by monotonicity we can apply our result uniformly for all $L \in \mathcal{L}$ with, e.g., $\mu = 34d\hat{\vartheta}_1^{11/2}\hat{\vartheta}_2\rho$. In particular, there are constants $\tilde{\alpha}_0$ and $\tilde{C}$, depending only on $d, \hat{\vartheta}_1, \hat{\vartheta}_2, \hat{b}, \hat{c}$ and ρ , and a function $w = w_{\rho, \mu} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, \infty)$, such that (6) holds for all elliptic operators in $L \in \mathcal{L}$.

Remark 2.4. As mentioned in the introduction, the usefulness of our result has already been shown in the recent preprint [BTV15]. More precisely, based on the Carleman estimate from Theorem 2.1, they show so-called *quantitative unique continuation principles, sampling theorems* as well as *equidistribution theorems* for solutions of certain variable coefficient elliptic partial differential equations or inequalities. In order to stress the usefulness of our result, we formulate exemplarily a special case of the sampling theorem from [BTV15]. Thereafter, we discuss why, e.g., the Carleman estimate from Ineq. (1) is not satisfactory to obtain such a result. Beforehand, we introduce some notation.

Let $\delta > 0$. We say that a sequence $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, is δ -*equidistributed*, if

$$\forall j \in \mathbb{Z}^d: \quad B(z_j, \delta) \subset (-1/2, 1/2)^d + j.$$

Corresponding to a δ -equidistributed sequence $z_j \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define the set

$$S_\delta = \bigcup_{j \in \mathbb{Z}^d} B(z_j, \delta) \subset \mathbb{R}^d.$$

Note that the set S_δ depends on the choice of the δ -equidistributed sequence.

Theorem 2.5 ([BTV15]). Assume

$$\varepsilon_1 := 1 - 33d(\sqrt{d} + 2)\vartheta_1^{11/2}(e\vartheta_1^{3/2} + 1)\vartheta_2 > 0. \quad (7)$$

Then for all measurable and bounded $V : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, all $\psi \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\zeta \in L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ satisfying $|L\psi| \leq |V\psi| + |\zeta|$ almost everywhere on $\mathbb{R}^d$, all $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and all δ -equidistributed sequences we have

$$\|\psi\|_{S_\delta}^2 + \delta^2 \|\zeta\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2 \geq c_{\text{sfcUC}} \|\psi\|_{\mathbb{R}^d}^2,$$

where

$$c_{\text{sfcUC}} = d_1 \left(\frac{\delta}{d_2} \right)^{\frac{d_3}{\varepsilon_1} (1 - \ln \varepsilon_1 + \|V\|_\infty^{2/3} + G^2 \|b\|_\infty^2 + \|c\|_\infty^{2/3})} \quad (8)$$

and d_1, d_2 , and d_3 are constants depending only on ϑ_1, ϑ_2 , and the dimension d .

The constants d_1 , d_2 and d_3 are given explicitly in [BTV15]. Note that the exponent in (8) can be interpreted as an estimate on the vanishing order as studied in [DF88, Kuk98]. The obtained estimate of vanishing order and its dependence on ellipticity and Lipschitz parameters originates from the particular form of our Carleman estimate, including C , α_0 , w , and the cubic behaviour of α .

Certainly, Theorem 2.5 can be proven by using the Carleman estimate (1) of [EV03]. However, then Assumption (7) would involve some function of κ and Ξ . Since κ and Ξ itself are abstract functions of ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 , it would be not clear if the corresponding Assumption (7) is ever satisfied. Moreover, in [EV03] no monotonicity condition on κ and Ξ is given. For this reason, it is even not possible to verify the corresponding Assumption (7) by choosing ϑ_1 and ϑ_2 sufficiently small.

3. Preliminary relations and quantitative estimates

In this section we provide some preparatory estimates and identities for the proof of Theorem 2.1. In particular, we will prove the quantitative estimates needed for our quantitative version of a Carleman estimate. First we introduce some notation. Let L_0 be the part of L containing only the second order term, i.e.

$$L_0 u := -\operatorname{div}(A \nabla u).$$

For $k \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ let $e_k \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be the k -th unit vector. For $g \in \{\sigma, w\}$ and real-valued $f \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ we define the functions $F_g^A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $D_f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $h_g^A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$F_g^A := -\frac{gL_0 g}{\nabla g^T A \nabla g} - 1, \quad D_f := w \frac{\nabla f^T A \nabla w}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} + \frac{1}{2} f F_w^A, \quad \text{and} \quad h_g^A := \frac{g A \nabla g}{\nabla g^T A \nabla g}.$$

Note that $F_g^{A_0}$ refers to the function $F_g^{A_0} = -g \operatorname{div}(A_0 \nabla g) / (\nabla g^T A_0 \nabla g) - 1$. Moreover, we introduce the matrix-valued function $M_g^A : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$,

$$M_g^A := -\frac{1}{2} F_g^A A + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}(h_g^A \circ A) - \frac{1}{2} \left(AD(h_g^A) + [AD(h_g^A)]^T \right).$$

Here $h_g^A \circ A$ denotes entrywise multiplication, i.e. $h_g^A \circ A := (h_g^A a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$, while the divergence of a matrix denotes entrywise divergence. The matrix $D(h_g^A)$ is defined as the $d \times d$ matrix $(\nabla(h_g^A)_1 \nabla(h_g^A)_2 \dots \nabla(h_g^A)_d)$, i.e. $D(h_g^A) := (\partial_i e_j^T h_g^A)_{i,j=1}^d$. Finally, we define $\psi : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $\psi(r) := \varphi(r)/(r\varphi'(r))$. Note that $\psi(r) = e^{\mu r}$.

The following lemma provides some basic properties of the functions introduced above.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\rho = 1$, $\vartheta_1 \geq 1$, $\vartheta_2 \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}(1, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ be satisfied. Then, almost everywhere on B_1 , we have for the matrix-valued functions M_w^A and M_σ^A the relations*

$$M_w^A = \psi(\sigma) M_\sigma^A + \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \left[A - A \frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^T}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} A \right], \quad M_\sigma^{A_0} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad M_\sigma^A \nabla \sigma = 0,$$

and for the functions F_w^A , F_σ^A and $F_\sigma^{A_0}$ the relations

$$F_w^A = \psi(\sigma) F_\sigma^A - \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \quad \text{and} \quad F_\sigma^{A_0} = d - 2.$$

The relations of Lemma 3.1 can be found in [EV03], see also [MRV11]. Note that our matrix-valued function M_g^A coincides with the matrix-valued function S_g^A of [MRV11], $g \in \{w, \sigma\}$. Indeed, the matrix S_g^A is defined by

$$2(S_g^A)_{ij} := -F_g^A a^{ij} \delta_{ij} + \operatorname{div}(h_g^A) a^{ij} \delta_{ij} - \partial_k(h_g^A)_j a^{ki} - \partial_k(h_g^A)_i a^{kj} + (h_g^A)_k \partial_k a^{ij},$$

which coincides with $2(M_g^A)_{ij}$. However, since no details of the proof are given in [EV03, MRV11] we give a proof of Lemma 3.1 in Appendix A.

In the following proposition we prove the quantitative estimates needed for our quantitative version of a Carleman estimate.

Proposition 3.2. *Let $\rho = 1$, $\vartheta_1 \geq 1$, $\vartheta_2 \geq 0$ and $\mathcal{A}(1, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2)$ be satisfied. Then, for all $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and almost everywhere on B_1 we have the estimates*

$$|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| \leq \sigma C'_F, \quad |\xi^T M_\sigma^A \xi| \leq \sigma C_M \xi^T A \xi, \quad |F_w^A| \leq C_F, \quad \text{and} \quad |L_0 \psi(\sigma)| \leq C_\psi / \sigma,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C'_F &:= 3d\vartheta_1^{7/2}\vartheta_2, & C_F &:= e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \left(\sqrt{\vartheta_1}(C'_F + \mu) + |d-2| \right), \\ C_M &:= 11d\vartheta_1^{11/2}\vartheta_2, & C_\psi &:= \mu e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \vartheta_1^2 \left(\sqrt{\vartheta_1}(C'_F + \mu) + d-1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Recall that the coefficients a^{ij} are almost everywhere on B_1 differentiable. We start by estimating $|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}|$. By Lemma 3.1 and the definition of F_σ^A we have

$$F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0} = -\frac{\sigma L_0 \sigma}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} - 1 - (d-2).$$

We calculate

$$\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma = \sigma^{-2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x \quad \text{and} \quad L_0 \sigma = \sigma^{-3} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x - \sigma^{-1} \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x)$$

and obtain

$$F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0} = \frac{\sigma^2 \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x)}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} - d = \frac{\sigma^2 \sum_{i,l} (\partial_i a^{il}) e_l^T A_0^{-1} x + \sigma^2 \operatorname{Tr}(A A_0^{-1})}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} - d. \quad (9)$$

By our assumption on ellipticity and Lipschitz continuity we have $|e_l^T A_0^{-1} x| \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \sigma$, $\sum_{i,l=1}^d |\partial_i a^{il}| \leq d\vartheta_2$ and $x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-2} \sigma^2$. Hence,

$$|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| \leq \sigma d \vartheta_1^{5/2} \vartheta_2 + \left| \frac{\sigma^2 \operatorname{Tr}(A A_0^{-1})}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} - d \right| = \sigma d \vartheta_1^{5/2} \vartheta_2 + |\operatorname{Tr}(T)|,$$

where

$$T := g A A_0^{-1} - \operatorname{Id} \quad \text{and} \quad g := \frac{\sigma^2}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x}.$$

Next we estimate $|\operatorname{Tr}(T)| \leq d \|T\|$. We have

$$\|T\| = \|g A A_0^{-1} - g A_0 A_0^{-1} + g A_0 A_0^{-1} - \operatorname{Id}\| \leq |g| \|A A_0^{-1} - A_0 A_0^{-1}\| + |g - 1|.$$

By

By our ellipticity assumption we have $g = \sigma^2 / (x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x) \leq \vartheta_1^2$ and

$$|g - 1| = \left| \frac{x^T A_0^{-1} (A_0 - A) A_0^{-1} x}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} \right| \leq \|A - A_0\| \frac{x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} \leq \vartheta_1 \|A - A_0\|.$$

For the norm $\|A_0 - A\|$ we use our assumption on Lipschitz continuity and obtain

$$\|A_0 - A\| \leq \sqrt{\|A - A_0\|_1 \|A - A_0\|_\infty} \leq \vartheta_2 |x| \leq \vartheta_2 \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \sigma. \quad (10)$$

By the same argument we have $\|A A_0^{-1} - A_0 A_0^{-1}\| \leq \vartheta_1^{3/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma$. Hence we have $\|T\| \leq 2\vartheta_1^{7/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma$ and we obtain the claimed bound $|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| \leq \sigma C'_F$.

Now we turn to the estimate $|\xi^T M_\sigma^A \xi| \leq \sigma C_M \xi^T A \xi$. From Lemma 3.1 we infer that $M_\sigma^{A_0} A_0^{-1} A = 0$. Note also that $h_\sigma^{A_0} = x$ and $D(h_\sigma^{A_0}) = I$. Hence

$$M_\sigma^A = M_\sigma^A - M_\sigma^{A_0} A_0^{-1} A = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + S_3^T$$

where

$$S_1 := -\frac{1}{2} (F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}) A, \quad S_2 := \frac{1}{2} (\operatorname{div}(h_\sigma^A \circ A) - dA) \quad \text{and} \quad S_3 := -\frac{1}{2} A (D(h_\sigma^A) - I).$$

For the second summand S_2 we have by the product rule for the divergence and Eq. (9)

$$S_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(\left[\nabla \left(\frac{\sigma^2 a^{ij}}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} \right)^T A A_0^{-1} x \right]_{i,j=1}^d + A (F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}) \right) =: S_5 + S_6.$$

Hence, S_1 and S_6 cancel out and we have $M_\sigma^A = S_5 + S_3 + S_3^T$. For S_5 we calculate

$$S_5 = \frac{1}{2} S_7 + \frac{1}{2} S_8 + S_9,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_7 &:= \frac{\sigma^2}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} [(\nabla a^{ij})^T A A_0^{-1} x]_{i,j=1}^d, \\ S_8 &:= -\frac{\sigma^2 A}{(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^2} \sum_k x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_k A) A_0^{-1} x e_k^T A A_0^{-1} x, \\ S_9 &:= A - \frac{\sigma^2 A}{(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\partial_k A$ denotes the matrix $(\partial_k a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$. For the Frobenius norm of S_7 we have using $g \leq \vartheta_1^2$, $\sum_j |\partial_k a^{ij}|^2 \leq \vartheta_2^2$ and $|A A_0^{-1} x| \leq \vartheta_1^{3/2} \sigma$

$$\|S_7\|_F = g \sqrt{\sum_{i,j=1}^d |(\nabla a^{ij})^T A A_0^{-1} x|^2} \leq g \sqrt{\sum_{i,j,k=1}^d |\partial_k a^{ij}|^2 |(A A_0^{-1} x)_k|^2} \leq \sqrt{d} \vartheta_1^{7/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma,$$

and hence we obtain

$$|\xi^T S_7 \xi| \leq \|S_7\| \xi^T \xi \leq \|S_7\|_F \xi^T \xi \leq \|S_7\|_F \vartheta_1 \xi^T A \xi \leq \sqrt{d} \vartheta_1^{9/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma \xi^T A \xi.$$

For S_8 we use Hölder's inequality and $|AA_0^{-1}x| \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1} x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x$ and obtain

$$|\xi^T S_8 \xi| \leq \frac{\xi^T A \xi \sigma^2 \sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^{3/2}} \left(\sum_{k=1}^d |x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_k A) A_0^{-1} x|^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

Since $\|\partial_k A\| \leq \sqrt{d} \|\partial_k A\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{d} \vartheta_2$ and $x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-1} x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$ we obtain

$$|\xi^T S_8 \xi| \leq \frac{\xi^T A \xi \sigma^2 \sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^{3/2}} d \vartheta_2 x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x \leq \frac{\xi^T A \xi \sigma^2 \vartheta_1^{4/2}}{(x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}} d \vartheta_2 \leq d \vartheta_1^{5/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma \xi^T A \xi.$$

For S_9 we calculate

$$|\xi^T S_9 \xi| = \frac{\xi^T A \xi}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^2} |(C^T x)^T (y - x) - (y - x)^T C x| \leq \frac{\xi^T A \xi (|Cx| + |C^T x|) |x - y|}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^2},$$

where we used the notations $C = A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x x^T A_0^{-1}$ and $y = AA_0^{-1} x$. The inequalities $|Cx| \leq \sigma^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2} (x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}$, $|C^T x| \leq \sigma^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2} (x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}$, $|x - y| \leq \|A - A_0\| (x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}$, and $x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-1} x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$ imply

$$|\xi^T S_9 \xi| \leq \frac{2 \xi^T A \xi \sigma^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2} \|A - A_0\| (x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^{3/2}} \leq \frac{2 \xi^T A \xi \sigma^2 \vartheta_1^3 \|A - A_0\|}{x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x}.$$

Using $x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-1} \sigma^2$ and Ineq. (10) we obtain

$$|\xi^T S_9 \xi| \leq 2 \xi^T A \xi \vartheta_1^4 \|A - A_0\| \leq 2 \xi^T A \xi \vartheta_1^{9/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma.$$

For S_5 we finally obtain the estimate

$$|\xi^T S_5 \xi| \leq 3d \vartheta_1^{9/2} \vartheta_2 \sigma \xi^T A \xi. \quad (11)$$

Now we start estimating S_3 . We have $D(h_\sigma^A) = gD(AA_0^{-1}x) + \text{diag}(\nabla g) X A_0^{-1} A$, where $X := (x \cdots x)^T$ and $\text{diag}(v) := \text{diag}(v_1, \dots, v_d)$ for $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For $\partial_k g$ we calculate

$$\partial_k g = \frac{2e_k^T A_0^{-1} x}{x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x} - \frac{x^T A_0^{-1} x}{(x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x)^2} (2e_k^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x + x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_k A) A_0^{-1} x).$$

Hence,

$$S_3 = -\frac{1}{2} A (S_{10} + S_{11} + S_{12})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{10} &:= gD(AA_0^{-1}x) - I, \\ S_{11} &:= \frac{2}{x^T A_0^{-1} AA_0^{-1} x} [A_0^{-1}x - gA_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x] x^T A_0^{-1} A, \end{aligned}$$

$$S_{12} := -\frac{g}{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x} (x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_i A) A_0^{-1} x)_{i=1}^d x^T A_0^{-1} A.$$

For the norm of S_{10} we calculate using $D(x) = I$

$$\begin{aligned} \|S_{10}\| &\leq g \|D(AA_0^{-1}x - x)\| + |g - 1| = g \|A_0^{-1}A + C - I\| + |g - 1| \\ &\leq g \|A_0^{-1}\| \cdot \|A - A_0\| + g \|C\| + |g - 1|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$C = \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_i a^{jk}) e_k^T A_0^{-1} x \right)_{i,j=1}^d.$$

The existing bounds $g \leq \vartheta_1^2$, $|g - 1| \leq \vartheta_1^3 \|A - A_0\|$, $\|A - A_0\| \leq \vartheta_2 \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \sigma$ and

$$\|C\| \leq \|C\|_F \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i,j,k=1}^d |\partial_i a^{jk}|^2 |e_k^T A_0^{-1} x|^2} \leq \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d \vartheta_2^2 |A_0^{-1} x|^2} \leq \sqrt{d} \vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 \sigma$$

give us $\|S_{10}\| \leq 3\sqrt{d}\vartheta_1^{7/2}\vartheta_2\sigma$. For S_{11} we calculate using Cauchy-Schwarz's inequality, $|AA_0^{-1}x| \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}$, $x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-1} x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$, $T = gAA_0^{-1} - I$, and $\|T\| \leq 2\vartheta_1^{7/2}\vartheta_2\sigma$ as before

$$\|S_{11}\| \leq \frac{2\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}} |(I - gA_0^{-1}A)A_0^{-1}x| \leq 2\vartheta_1 \|T\| \leq 4\vartheta_1^{9/2}\vartheta_2\sigma.$$

For S_{12} we use Cauchy Schwarz's inequality and $|AA_0^{-1}x| \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}$, and obtain

$$\|S_{12}\| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}g}{(x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2}} |(x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_i A) A_0^{-1} x)_{i=1}^d|$$

Since $|x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_i A) A_0^{-1} x| \leq \sqrt{d}\vartheta_2 x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$ we have $|(x^T A_0^{-1} (\partial_i A) A_0^{-1} x)_{i=1}^d| \leq d\vartheta_2 x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$. Hence, using $x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x \geq \vartheta_1^{-1} x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x$, $g \leq \vartheta_1^2$ and $x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x \leq \vartheta_1 \sigma^2$ we obtain

$$\|S_{12}\| \leq \vartheta_1 g d \vartheta_2 (x^T A_0^{-1} A_0^{-1} x)^{1/2} \leq d\vartheta_1^{7/2}\vartheta_2\sigma.$$

Note that for any matrix C we have by ellipticity of A the estimate $\xi^T A C \xi \leq \vartheta_1 \|C\| \xi^T A \xi$.

Hence, we obtain

$$|\xi^T S_3 \xi| \leq \frac{1}{2} \xi^T A \xi \vartheta_1 \|S_{10} + S_{11} + S_{12}\| \leq 4d\vartheta_1^{11/2}\vartheta_2\sigma \xi^T A \xi. \quad (12)$$

From Ineq. (11) and (12) we conclude that $|\xi^T M_\sigma^A \xi| = |\xi^T (S_5 + S_3 + S_3^T) \xi| \leq \sigma C_M \xi^T A \xi$.

In order to prove the bound $|F_w^A| \leq C_F$ we use the formulas $F_w^A = \psi(\sigma)F_\sigma^A - \sigma\psi'(\sigma)$ and $F_\sigma^{A_0} = d - 2$ from Lemma 3.1, our previous bound $|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| \leq \sigma C_F'$, $\psi'(\sigma) = \mu\psi(\sigma)$, $\psi(\sigma) \leq e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}$ and $\sigma \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}$ on B_1 to obtain

$$|F_w^A| \leq \psi(\sigma) (|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| + |F_\sigma^{A_0} - \sigma\mu|) \leq C_F.$$

For our last bound $|L_0\psi(\sigma)| \leq C_\psi/\sigma$ we note that $\nabla\psi(\sigma) = \mu e^{\mu\sigma}\sigma^{-1}A_0^{-1}x$, use the product rule for the divergence and Eq. (9) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} -L_0\psi(\sigma) &= \operatorname{div}(A\nabla\psi(\sigma)) = \mu \left(\nabla \left(\frac{e^{\mu\sigma}}{\sigma} \right)^T A A_0^{-1}x + \frac{e^{\mu\sigma}}{\sigma} \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1}x) \right) \\ &= \mu e^{\mu\sigma} \left(\frac{\mu}{\sigma^2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1}x - \frac{1}{\sigma^3} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1}x + \frac{1}{\sigma} \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1}x) \right) \\ &= \mu e^{\mu\sigma} \frac{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1}x}{\sigma^3} (\mu\sigma - 1 + d + (F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0})). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows from $x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1}x \leq \vartheta_1^2 \sigma^2$, $\sigma \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}$ and $|F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}| \leq \sigma C_F'$. $\square$

4. Proof of Theorem 2.1

As mentioned in the introduction, the proof of Theorem 2.1 is based on ideas from [EV03, BK05]. One might think that once the quantitative bounds from Section 3 are at hand, the result is obtained simply by following the existing proofs [EV03, BK05]. However, due to the fact that we want to have an explicit dependence on all the parameters and also treat the case $\kappa = 1$ with additional gradient term in the lower bound at the same time (in the sense of Ineq. (1)), we need to employ non-trivial extensions of the techniques used in the mentioned papers. More precisely, the proof of Carleman estimate in [EV03] has the gradient term in the lower bound which is sometimes needed in the applications, but the non-scaled version is valid on $B_\kappa \setminus \{0\}$ with undetermined $\kappa < 1$, and the proof does not allow for a scaling which keeps the constants explicit. The Carleman estimate in [BK05], on the other hand, is valid on the whole punctured unit ball in the non-scaled version, but the gradient cannot be easily preserved without breaking the proof. Our extension of their techniques addresses this issue.

First we prove a special case of the theorem and assume that

$$u \in C_c^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\}), \quad \rho = 1, \quad b, c \equiv 0, \quad \text{and} \quad u \text{ is real-valued.} \quad (13)$$

Note that in this case we have $L = L_0$. The general case then follows by regularization, scaling, the fact that Carleman estimates are stable under first order perturbations, and by adding the obtained Carleman estimate for $\operatorname{Re} u$ and $\operatorname{Im} u$. These steps are carried out in detail at the end of this section.

We set $f = w^{-\alpha}u$. The following lemma can be found in [EV03, MRV11]. For completeness we give a proof in Appendix B.

Lemma 4.1. *For all $\alpha > 0$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &:= \int \frac{w^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} (w^{-\alpha} L_0 u)^2 \\ &\geq 4\alpha \int (\nabla f)^T M_w^A \nabla f - \alpha \int F_w^A L_0(f^2) + 4\alpha^2 \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

We start the proof by providing a lower bound on the first term of the right hand side of Ineq. (14). With the notation

$$\tilde{\nabla} f := \nabla f - \frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^T}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} A \nabla f = \nabla f - \frac{\nabla w \nabla w^T}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} A \nabla f$$

we have

$$\left(\frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^T}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} A \nabla f \right)^T A \tilde{\nabla} f = 0,$$

and using the first identity of Lemma 3.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f^T M_w^A \nabla f &= \psi(\sigma) \nabla f^T M_\sigma^A \nabla f + \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \nabla f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f \\ &= \psi(\sigma) \nabla f^T M_\sigma^A \nabla f + \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \left(\tilde{\nabla} f + \frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^T}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} A \nabla f \right)^T A \tilde{\nabla} f \\ &= \psi(\sigma) \nabla f^T M_\sigma^A \nabla f + \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f. \end{aligned}$$

Now using $M_\sigma^A \nabla \sigma = 0$ established in Lemma 3.1 and the fact that M_σ^A is symmetric, we obtain

$$\nabla f^T M_w^A \nabla f = \psi(\sigma) \tilde{\nabla} f^T M_\sigma^A \tilde{\nabla} f + \sigma \psi'(\sigma) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f.$$

From Proposition 3.2 we obtain for almost all $x \in B_1$

$$\nabla f^T M_w^A \nabla f \geq (\sigma \psi'(\sigma) - \psi(\sigma) \sigma C_M) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f. \quad (15)$$

Using Ineq. (15) we provide a lower bound on the first two terms of the right hand side of Ineq. (14). Lemma 3.1 implies

$$F_w^A = \psi(\sigma)(d-2) + \psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma, \quad \text{where} \quad B_\sigma^A := F_\sigma^A - F_\sigma^{A_0}. \quad (16)$$

We use Ineq. (15), Eq. (16), $L_0(f^2) = 2f L_0 f - 2 \nabla f^T A \nabla f$,

$$\nabla f^T A \nabla f = \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f + \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} \quad (17)$$

and Green's theorem, i.e. $\int u L_0 v = \int \nabla u^T A \nabla v$ for $u, v \in C_c^2(B_1)$, to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &:= 4\alpha \int (\nabla f)^T M_w^A \nabla f - \alpha \int F_w^A L_0(f^2) \\ &\geq 4\alpha \int (\sigma \psi'(\sigma) - \psi(\sigma) \sigma C_M) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f - (d-2)\alpha \int f^2 L_0 \psi(\sigma) \\ &\quad - 2\alpha \int (\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma) \left(f L_0 f - \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f - \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We apply Eq. (34) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &\geq 2\alpha \int (\sigma \psi'(\sigma) - 2\psi(\sigma) \sigma C_M + \psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f \\ &\quad - 2\alpha^3 \int (\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma) \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} f^2 - R_1, \quad (18) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$R_1 := (d-2)\alpha \int f^2 L_0 \psi(\sigma) + 4\alpha^2 \int (\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma) f D_f \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2}$$

$$- 2\alpha \int (\psi(\sigma)B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma)\sigma) \left[\frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} - w^{-\alpha} f L_0 u \right].$$

From Lemma 4.1 and Eq. (18) we infer that

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + \int \frac{w^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} (w^{-\alpha} L_0 u)^2 &\geq 2\alpha \int (\sigma \psi'(\sigma) - 2\psi(\sigma)\sigma C_M + \psi(\sigma)B_\sigma^A) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f \\ &\quad - 2\alpha^3 \int (\psi(\sigma)B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma)\sigma) \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} f^2 + 4\alpha^2 \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2. \end{aligned}$$

We use the identity $\psi' = \mu\psi$ and the estimate $|B_\sigma^A| \leq C_M \sigma$ from Proposition 3.2 and obtain with the notation $C_\mu := \mu - 3C_M$

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 + \int \frac{w^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} (w^{-\alpha} L_0 u)^2 &\geq 2\alpha C_\mu \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f \\ &\quad + 2\alpha^3 C_\mu \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} f^2 + 4\alpha^2 \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Note that $\mu - B_\sigma^A/\sigma > \mu - 3C_M = C_\mu > 0$ by our assumption on μ and Proposition 3.2. The identities (17),

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla f^T A \nabla f &= w^{-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \nabla u + \alpha^2 w^{-2} f^2 \nabla w^T A \nabla w - 2\alpha w^{-\alpha-1} f \nabla w^T A \nabla u \\ &= w^{-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \nabla u - \alpha^2 w^{-2} f^2 \nabla w^T A \nabla w - 2\alpha w^{-1} f \nabla w^T A \nabla f \end{aligned}$$

and

$$f \nabla w^T A \nabla f = f w^{-1} D_f \nabla w^T A \nabla w - \frac{1}{2} f^2 w^{-1} F_w^A \nabla w^T A \nabla w$$

imply

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f &= w^{-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \nabla u - \alpha^2 w^{-2} f^2 \nabla w^T A \nabla w - 2\alpha f w^{-2} D_f \nabla w^T A \nabla w \\ &\quad + \alpha w^{-2} f^2 F_w^A \nabla w^T A \nabla w - \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with Ineq. (19), and using $\sigma \geq w$, $\psi \geq 1$ and the bound $F_w^A \geq -C_F$ from Proposition 3.2, we derive at

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 + \int \frac{w^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} (w^{-\alpha} L_0 u)^2 &\geq 2\alpha C_\mu \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \nabla u \\ &\quad - 2C_\mu C_F \alpha^2 \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} f^2 + 4\alpha^2 \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &:= (d-2)\alpha \int f^2 L_0 \psi(\sigma) + 4\alpha^2 \int (\psi(\sigma)B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma)\sigma + C_\mu \sigma \psi(\sigma)) f D_f \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} \\ &\quad - 2\alpha \int (\psi(\sigma)B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma)\sigma) \left[\frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} - w^{-\alpha} f L_0 u \right] + 2C_\mu \alpha \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}. \end{aligned}$$

We drop the (positive) term $2\alpha C_\mu \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \tilde{\nabla} f^T A \tilde{\nabla} f$ in Ineq. (19) and add the inequality obtained in this way with Ineq. (20). This gives us

$$R + \int \frac{w^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} (w^{-\alpha} L_0 u)^2 \geq \alpha C_\mu \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \nabla u \\ + \alpha^2 (\alpha - C_F) C_\mu \int \sigma \psi(\sigma) \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} f^2 + 4\alpha^2 \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2, \quad (21)$$

where $R := (R_1 + R_2)/2$ is given by

$$R = (d-2)\alpha \int f^2 L_0 \psi(\sigma) + 4\alpha^2 \int \left(\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma + \frac{C_\mu}{2} \sigma \psi(\sigma) \right) f D_f \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} \\ - 2\alpha \int \left(\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma - \frac{C_\mu}{2} \sigma \psi(\sigma) \right) \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} \\ + 2\alpha \int (\psi(\sigma) B_\sigma^A - \psi'(\sigma) \sigma) w^{-\alpha} f L_0 u.$$

Next we provide an upper bound on $|R|$. Inequality $|B_\sigma^A| \leq C_M \sigma$ from Proposition 3.2 and our assumption $\mu > 3C_M$ imply the estimates

$$\left| \frac{B_\sigma^A}{\sigma} - \mu + \frac{C_\mu}{2} \right| = \left| \frac{B_\sigma^A}{\sigma} - \frac{\mu}{2} - \frac{3C_M}{2} \right| \leq \frac{4}{3}\mu, \\ \left| \frac{B_\sigma^A}{\sigma} - \mu - \frac{C_\mu}{2} \right| = \left| \frac{B_\sigma^A}{\sigma} - \frac{3}{2}\mu + \frac{3}{2}C_M \right| \leq \frac{3}{2}\mu - \frac{1}{2}C_M \leq \frac{3}{2}\mu$$

and $|B_\sigma^A/\sigma - \mu| \leq 4\mu/3$. Hence, using $|L_0 \psi(\sigma)| \leq C_\psi/\sigma$ from Proposition 3.2, $w \leq \sigma$, $\psi' = \mu\psi$, $\sigma \leq \mu_1 w$, $\psi(\sigma) \leq e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}$ and $\nabla w^T A \nabla w \leq (\varphi'(\sigma))^2 \vartheta_1^2 \leq \vartheta_1^2$ we obtain

$$|R| \leq C_\psi d \alpha \int \frac{f^2}{w} + 3\alpha \mu \mu_1 e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \int \left(2\alpha \vartheta_1^2 \frac{|f D_f|}{w} + w \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} + w^{1-\alpha} |f L_0 u| \right) \\ \leq K \left[\alpha \int \frac{f^2}{w} + \alpha^2 \int \frac{|f D_f|}{w} + \alpha \int w \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} + \alpha \int w^{1-\alpha} |f L_0 u| \right],$$

where

$$K := \max \left\{ dC_\psi, 6\mu\mu_1 e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \vartheta_1^2 \right\} \leq 6d\mu\mu_1 e^{\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \vartheta_1^2 \left(\sqrt{\vartheta_1} (C_F' + \mu) + d \right).$$

Using $(a-b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$, $\nabla w^T A \nabla w \leq \vartheta_1^2$ and $w \leq \sigma \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}$ on B_1 , we obtain

$$\frac{w}{\vartheta_1^2} \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} \leq w \frac{(\nabla w^T A \nabla f)^2}{(\nabla w^T A \nabla w)^2} \leq 2 \frac{D_f^2}{w} + \frac{C_F^2}{2} \frac{f^2}{w} \leq 2\sqrt{\vartheta_1} \frac{D_f^2}{w^2} + \frac{C_F^2}{2} \frac{f^2}{w}.$$

Furthermore, for all $t > 0$ we have

$$\int f^2 \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \int \frac{f^2}{w}, \\ \alpha \int w^{1-\alpha} |f L_0 u| \leq \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1} \alpha^2}{2} \int \frac{f^2}{w} + \frac{1}{2} \int w^{2-2\alpha} |L_0 u|^2, \text{ and}$$

$$\int w^{-1}|fD_f| \leq t \int w^{-1}f^2 + \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{4t} \int w^{-2}D_f^2.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|R|}{K} \leq & \alpha \left(1 + \alpha t + \frac{C_F^2 \vartheta_1^2}{2} + \frac{\alpha \sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{2} \right) \int w^{-1}f^2 \\ & + \alpha \left(\alpha \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{4t} + 2\vartheta_1^{5/2} \right) \int w^{-2}D_f^2 + \frac{1}{2} \int w^{2-2\alpha}|L_0 u|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

From Ineq. (21), $\sigma\psi(\sigma) \geq w$, the bound $\nabla w^T A \nabla w \geq \vartheta_1^{-2} \mu_1^{-2} e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}$ and Ineq. (22), we finally obtain

$$K_1 \int w^{2-2\alpha}|L_0 u|^2 \geq K_2 \int w^{-1}f^2 + K_3 \int w^{-2}D_f^2 + K_4 \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \nabla u, \quad (23)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &:= K/2 + (\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2 e^{2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}, \\ K_2 &:= C_\mu \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2} \alpha^3 - \left[C_\mu C_F \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2} + K \left(t + \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{2} \right) \right] \alpha^2 - K \left[1 + \frac{C_F^2 \vartheta_1^2}{2} \right] \alpha, \\ K_3 &:= \left[4 \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2} - K \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{4t} \right] \alpha^2 - 2K \vartheta_1^{5/2} \alpha \text{ and} \\ K_4 &:= C_\mu \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Now we choose t large enough, such that the coefficient of α^2 in K_3 is positive, and thereafter we choose α sufficiently large, such that K_3 is non-negative. Our particular choice is

$$t = t_1 := \frac{1}{8} K \vartheta_1^{5/2} \mu_1^2 e^{2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha \geq K \vartheta_1^{9/2} \mu_1^2 e^{2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}} =: \alpha_1.$$

Then

$$K_3 = 2 \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2} \alpha^2 - 2K \vartheta_1^{5/2} \alpha \geq 0$$

and Ineq. (23) implies

$$K_1 \int w^{2-2\alpha}|L_0 u|^2 \geq K_2 \int w^{-1}f^2 + K_4 \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \nabla u. \quad (24)$$

If additionally

$$\alpha \geq \frac{q}{p} + \sqrt{\frac{q^2}{p^2} + \frac{2r}{p}} =: \alpha_2,$$

where

$$p := C_\mu \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2}, \quad q := C_\mu C_F \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1 \mu_1)^2} + K \left(t_1 + \frac{\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}{2} \right), \quad r := K \left(1 + \frac{C_F^2 \vartheta_1^2}{2} \right),$$

then

$$K_2 \geq \frac{1}{2} C_\mu \frac{e^{-2\mu\sqrt{\vartheta_1}}}{(\vartheta_1\mu_1)^2} \alpha^3 =: K_5 \alpha^3.$$

Moreover, it can be shown that $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2$. By using $\min\{K_5, C_\mu\} = K_5$ we obtain from Ineq. (24) for all $\alpha \geq \hat{\alpha}_0$

$$\alpha^3 \int w^{-1-2\alpha} u^2 + \alpha \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \nabla u \leq \hat{C} \int w^{2-2\alpha} (L_0 u)^2, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\hat{\alpha}_0 = \hat{\alpha}_0(d, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \mu) := \max\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} = \alpha_2 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{C} = \hat{C}(d, \vartheta_1, \vartheta_2, \mu) := \frac{K_1}{K_5}.$$

This proves Theorem 2.1 in case (13).

Now we lift the restriction that $u \in C_c^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$ and assume that $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ real-valued with support in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$. Let ϕ be a non-negative and real-valued function in $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with the properties that $\|\phi\|_1 = 1$ and $\text{supp } \phi \subset \overline{B_1}$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ we define $\phi_\varepsilon : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_0^+$ by $\phi_\varepsilon(x) = \varepsilon^{-d} \phi(x/\varepsilon)$. The function ϕ_ε belongs to $C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and satisfies $\text{supp } \phi_\varepsilon \subset \overline{B_\varepsilon}$. Now define

$$u_\varepsilon = \phi_\varepsilon * u, \quad u_\varepsilon(x) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \phi_\varepsilon(x-y) u(y) dy.$$

If ε is small enough, say $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, then $u_\varepsilon \in C_c^\infty(B_1 \setminus \{0\})$, see [Zie89, Theorem 1.6.1]. Hence we can apply Ineq. (25) to the function u_ε . By definition we have

$$L_0 u_\varepsilon = - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i (a^{ij} \partial_j (\phi_\varepsilon * u)) = - \sum_{i,j=1}^d (\partial_i a^{ij}) (\phi_\varepsilon * \partial_j u) - \sum_{i,j=1}^d a^{ij} (\phi_\varepsilon * \partial_i \partial_j u).$$

Since $\partial_j u$ and $\partial_i \partial_j u$ are elements of $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, [Zie89, Theorem 1.6.1 (iii)] tells us that $\phi_\varepsilon * \partial_j u \rightarrow \partial_j u$ and $\phi_\varepsilon * \partial_i \partial_j u \rightarrow \partial_i \partial_j u$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as ε tends to zero. Hence $L_0 u_\varepsilon \rightarrow L_0 u$ in L^2 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since obviously $\nabla u_\varepsilon \rightarrow \nabla u$ and $u_\varepsilon \rightarrow u$ in L^2 as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$, and w^{-1} is bounded both from below and above on $\text{supp } u_\varepsilon$ uniformly for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$, we obtain Ineq. (25) for $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ real-valued with support in $B_1 \setminus \{0\}$ in the case $b, c \equiv 0$.

Now we lift the restriction on ρ and assume that $\rho > 0$ arbitrary and $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ real-valued with support in $B_\rho \setminus \{0\}$. We introduce the scaled coefficient functions $\tilde{a}^{ij}(x) := a^{ij}(\rho x)$ on B_1 , and define the scaled elliptic operator

$$\tilde{L}_0 := - \sum_{i,j=1}^d \partial_i (\tilde{a}^{ij} \partial_j).$$

Obviously, the Lipschitz constant of $\tilde{L}_0$ is $\rho \vartheta_2$ and the ellipticity constant is ϑ_1 . By our assumption on μ , we can apply Ineq. (25) to the function $\tilde{u} : B_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{u}(x) := u(\rho x)$, and obtain for all $\alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha}_0$

$$\alpha \int \tilde{w}^{1-2\alpha} \nabla \tilde{u}^T A \nabla \tilde{u} + \alpha^3 \int \tilde{w}^{-1-2\alpha} \tilde{u}^2 \leq \tilde{C} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \tilde{w}^{2-2\alpha} (\tilde{L}_0 \tilde{u})^2,$$

where

$$\tilde{\alpha}_0 := \hat{\alpha}_0(d, \vartheta_1, \rho\vartheta_2, \mu), \quad \tilde{C} := \hat{C}(d, \vartheta_1, \rho\vartheta_2, \mu) \quad (26)$$

and $\tilde{w}(x) := w(\rho x)$ for $x \in B_1$. Note $w = w_{\rho, \mu} = \varphi(\sigma(x/\rho))$ and hence $\tilde{w}(x) = w_{1, \mu}(x)$. By the change of variables $y = x\rho$, we obtain for all $\alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha}_0$

$$\alpha\rho^2 \int w^{1-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \nabla u + \alpha^3 \int w^{-1-2\alpha} u^2 \leq \tilde{C}\rho^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} w^{2-2\alpha} (L_0 \tilde{u})^2, \quad (27)$$

which proves the theorem in the case $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ real-valued with support in $B_\rho \setminus \{0\}$ and $b, c \equiv 0$.

Now we lift the restriction that u is real-valued and, i.e. we allow complex-valued functions. We apply Ineq. (27) to the real part $\operatorname{Re} u$ and imaginary part $\operatorname{Im} u$ and add these two inequalities. We obtain Ineq. (27) for $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ complex-valued, since ∇ and L_0 commute with Re and Im , A is positive, and $(\nabla \operatorname{Re} u)^T A (\nabla \operatorname{Re} u) + (\nabla \operatorname{Im} u)^T A (\nabla \operatorname{Im} u) = \nabla u^T A \overline{\nabla u}$.

Finally we lift the restriction on b and c . Let $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be complex-valued with support in $B_\rho \setminus \{0\}$ and let $b, c \in L^\infty(B_\rho)$ be arbitrary complex valued functions. From $|a_1 + a_2 + a_3|^2 \leq 3(|a_1|^2 + |a_2|^2 + |a_3|^2)$ for complex numbers a_i we obtain

$$|L_0 u|^2 \leq 3(|Lu|^2 + |b^T \nabla u|^2 + |cu|^2) \leq 3(|Lu|^2 + \|b\|_\infty^2 \vartheta_1 \nabla u^T A \overline{\nabla u} + \|c\|_\infty^2 |u|^2).$$

By Ineq. (27) and $w(x) \leq \sqrt{\vartheta_1}$ on B_ρ , it follows that for all $\alpha \geq \tilde{\alpha}_0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha\rho^2 \int w^{-2\alpha+1} \nabla u^T A \overline{\nabla u} + \alpha^3 \int w^{-1-2\alpha} |u|^2 &\leq 3\tilde{C}\rho^4 \int w^{2-2\alpha} |Lu|^2 \\ &\quad + 3\tilde{C}\rho^4 \|b\|_\infty^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2} \int w^{1-2\alpha} \nabla u^T A \overline{\nabla u} + 3\tilde{C}\rho^4 \|c\|_\infty^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2} \int w^{-1-2\alpha} |u|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we can subsume the two last terms on the right hand side into the left hand side by choosing α sufficiently large. In particular, setting

$$C := 6\tilde{C} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_0 := \max \left\{ \tilde{\alpha}_0, C\rho^2 \|b\|_\infty^2 \vartheta_1^{3/2}, C^{1/3} \rho^{4/3} \|c\|_\infty^{2/3} \sqrt{\vartheta_1} \right\}, \quad (28)$$

we obtain the statement of the theorem for all $\alpha \geq \alpha_0$ and all $u \in W^{2,2}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with support in $B_\rho \setminus \{0\}$. $\square$

A. Proof of Lemma 3.1

First we prove the fourth relation. We use $\nabla w^T A \nabla w = \sigma^{-2} \varphi'(\sigma)^2 x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x$,

$$-L_0 w = \varphi''(\sigma) \frac{1}{\sigma^2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x - \varphi'(\sigma) \left[\frac{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x}{\sigma^3} - \frac{\operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x)}{\sigma} \right] \quad (29)$$

and since $\rho = 1$

$$\sigma \psi'(\sigma) = 1 - \frac{w}{\sigma \varphi'(\sigma)} - \frac{w \varphi''(\sigma)}{\varphi'(\sigma)^2}, \quad (30)$$

and obtain

$$F_w^A = -1 + \frac{w \varphi''(\sigma)}{\varphi'(\sigma)^2} - \frac{w}{\sigma \varphi'(\sigma)} + \frac{w \sigma \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x)}{\varphi'(\sigma) x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x}. \quad (31)$$

Note that $w = \varphi \circ \sigma$ and Eq. (29) with φ replaced by the identity reads

$$-L_0\sigma = -\sigma^{-3}x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x + \sigma^{-1} \operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x). \quad (32)$$

Using $\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma = \sigma^{-2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x$ and Eq. (32) we have by the definition of F_σ^A

$$\operatorname{div}(A A_0^{-1} x) = \frac{x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x}{\sigma^2} (F_\sigma^A + 2). \quad (33)$$

From Eq. (30), Eq. (31), Eq. (33) and the definition of ψ we obtain $F_w^A = -\sigma\psi'(\sigma) + \psi(\sigma)F_\sigma^A$, i.e. the fourth estimate of Lemma 3.1.

The fifth identity of Lemma 3.1 $F_\sigma^{A_0} = d - 2$ is a direct consequence of $\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma = \sigma^{-2} x^T A_0^{-1} A A_0^{-1} x$, $\sigma^2 = x^T A_0^{-1} x$ and Eq. (32).

We now turn to the proof of the first relation. By definition we have $M_w^A = \tilde{S}_1 + \tilde{S}_2 + \tilde{S}_3 + \tilde{S}_3^T$ where

$$\tilde{S}_1 := -\frac{1}{2} F_w^A A, \quad \tilde{S}_2 := \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}(h_w^A \circ A), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_3 := -\frac{1}{2} A D(h_w^A).$$

For the first summand we have, using the fourth identity of Lemma 3.1,

$$\tilde{S}_1 = -\frac{1}{2} (\psi(\sigma) F_\sigma^A - \sigma\psi'(\sigma)) A.$$

For the second term we calculate using the chain rule and the product rule for the divergence

$$\tilde{S}_2 = \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\varphi(\sigma)}{\sigma\varphi'(\sigma)} \frac{\sigma A \nabla \sigma}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} \circ A \right) = \frac{1}{2} \sigma\psi'(\sigma) A + \frac{1}{2} \psi(\sigma) \operatorname{div} \left(\frac{\sigma A \nabla \sigma}{\nabla \sigma^T A \nabla \sigma} \circ A \right).$$

For the third summand we use the chain rule to see that $D(h_w^A) = D(\psi(\sigma)h_\sigma^A)$. Hence, by the product rule

$$\tilde{S}_3 = -\frac{1}{2} \psi(\sigma) A D(h_\sigma^A) - \frac{1}{2} A \psi'(\sigma) (\nabla \sigma) (h_\sigma^A)^T.$$

Putting everything together we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} M_w^A &= \psi(\sigma) M_\sigma^A + \sigma\psi'(\sigma) A - \frac{\psi'(\sigma)}{2} (A(\nabla \sigma)(h_\sigma^A)^T + h_\sigma^A(\nabla \sigma)^T A) \\ &= \psi(\sigma) M_\sigma^A + \sigma\psi'(\sigma) \left[A - \frac{1}{2} \left(A \frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^\perp}{\nabla \sigma^\perp A \nabla \sigma} A + A \frac{\nabla \sigma \nabla \sigma^\perp}{\nabla \sigma^\perp A \nabla \sigma} A \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

To prove the second relation $M_\sigma^{A_0} = 0$ we have by $h_\sigma^{A_0} = x$

$$\operatorname{div}(x \circ A_0) = d A_0 \quad \text{and} \quad D(h_\sigma^A) = I.$$

Hence, using $F_\sigma^{A_0} = d - 2$ we obtain

$$M_\sigma^{A_0} = -\frac{1}{2} F_\sigma^{A_0} A_0 + \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{div}(h_\sigma^A \circ A_0) - \frac{1}{2} A_0 D(h_\sigma^A) - \frac{1}{2} D(h_\sigma^A)^T A_0 = 0.$$

For the proof of the third relation we infer from the proof of Proposition 3.2 that $M_\sigma^A = (M_\sigma^A - M_\sigma^{A_0} A_0^{-1} A) = (S_5 + S_3 + S_3^T)$. Moreover, we have that $2S_5 = S_7 + S_8 + 2S_9$ and

$2S_3 = -A(S_{10} + S_{11} + S_{12})$. We rearrange the terms, recall that $g = \sigma^2/x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x$ and $\partial_k A = (\partial_k a^{ij})_{i,j=1}^d$, set $v = (x^\top A_0^{-1}(\partial_k A)A_0^{-1}x)_{k=1}^d$, use $D(AA_0^{-1}x) = A_0^{-1}A + C$, where

$$C = \left(\sum_{k=1}^d (\partial_i a^{jk}) e_k^\top A_0^{-1}x \right)_{i,j=1}^d,$$

and obtain that $M_\sigma^A = \sum_{i=1}^6 T_i$ with

$$T_1 := \frac{g}{2} [(\nabla a^{ij})^\top AA_0^{-1}x]_{i,j=1}^d - \frac{g}{2} C^\top A,$$

$$T_2 := \frac{gA}{2x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} vx^\top A_0^{-1}A - \frac{g}{2} AC,$$

$$T_3 := -\frac{gA}{x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x + \frac{g}{x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} AA_0^{-1}xx^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}A,$$

$$T_4 := \frac{g}{x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} AA_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}xx^\top A_0^{-1}A - gAA_0^{-1}A,$$

$$T_5 := 2A - \frac{2}{x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} AA_0^{-1}xx^\top A_0^{-1}A,$$

$$T_6 := \frac{g}{2x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} AA_0^{-1}xv^\top A - \frac{gA}{2x^\top A_0^{-1}AA_0^{-1}x} v^\top AA_0^{-1}x.$$

If we multiply from the right with $\nabla\sigma = \sigma^{-1}A_0^{-1}x$, then one easily sees that $T_i = 0$, $i \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$. It remains to show that $T_1\nabla\sigma = T_2\nabla\sigma = 0$. For this purpose, we calculate

$$\begin{aligned} \left([(\nabla a^{ik})^\top AA_0^{-1}x]_{i,k=1}^d A_0^{-1}x \right)_j &= \sum_k \sum_i \partial_i a^{jk} e_i^\top AA_0^{-1}x e_k^\top A_0^{-1}x \\ &= \sum_i e_i^\top AA_0^{-1}x C_{ij} = (C^\top AA_0^{-1}x)_j, \end{aligned}$$

hence $[(\nabla a^{ij})^\top AA_0^{-1}x]_{i,j=1}^d A_0^{-1}x = C^\top AA_0^{-1}x$ and $T_1\nabla\sigma = 0$.

For $T_2\nabla\sigma$ we calculate

$$(CA_0^{-1}x)_i = \sum_{j,k=1}^d e_j^\top A_0^{-1}x \partial_i a^{jk} e_k^\top A_0^{-1}x = x^\top A_0^{-1}(\partial_i A)A_0^{-1}x = v_i$$

and obtain

$$T_2\nabla\sigma = \frac{g}{2\sigma} Av - \frac{g}{2\sigma} ACA_0^{-1}x = \frac{g}{2\sigma} A(v - CA_0^{-1}x) = 0. \quad \square$$

B. Proof of Lemma 4.1

We recall that $f = w^{-\alpha}u$ and calculate

$$-w^{-\alpha}L_0u = \alpha(\alpha-1)w^{-2}f\nabla w^\top A\nabla w + 2\alpha w^{-1}\nabla f^\top A\nabla w - \alpha f w^{-1}L_0w - L_0f$$

$$= -L_0 f + \alpha^2 f w^{-2} \nabla w^T A \nabla w + 2\alpha w^{-2} (\nabla w^T A \nabla w) D_f. \quad (34)$$

Hence,

$$I_1 = \int \left(4\alpha^2 \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f^2 - 4\alpha D_f L_0 f + 4\alpha^3 \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f f \right) + P, \quad (35)$$

where

$$P := \int \left(\alpha^2 \frac{\sqrt{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}}{w} f - \frac{w}{\sqrt{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}} L_0 f \right)^2 \geq 0.$$

We use Green's formula, i.e. $\int u L_0 v = \int \nabla u^T A \nabla v$ for functions $u, v \in C_0^2(B_1)$, and obtain for the third term in Eq. (35)

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f f &= \int \frac{f}{w} \nabla w^T A \nabla f - \int \frac{f^2}{2w} L_0 w - \int \frac{f^2}{2w^2} \nabla w^T A \nabla w \\ &= \int \frac{f}{w} \nabla w^T A \nabla f - \int \frac{f^2}{2w^2} \nabla w^T A \nabla w - \int \nabla \left(\frac{f^2}{2w} \right)^T A \nabla w. \end{aligned}$$

By the quotient rule, the last term equals to the sum of the two first terms. Hence,

$$\int \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla w}{w^2} D_f f = 0.$$

For the second term in Eq. (35) we have

$$4\alpha \int D_f L_0 f = 4\alpha \int w \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla f}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} L_0 f + 2\alpha \int F_w^A f L_0 f.$$

By Green's formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\alpha \int F_w^A f L_0 f &= 2\alpha \int \nabla (F_w^A f)^T A \nabla f = 2\alpha \int f \nabla f^T A \nabla F_w^A + 2\alpha \int F_w^A \nabla f^T A \nabla f \\ &= \alpha \int (\nabla F_w^A)^T A \nabla (f^2) + 2\alpha \int F_w^A \nabla f^T A \nabla f \\ &= \alpha \int F_w^A L_0 (f^2) + 2\alpha \int F_w^A \nabla f^T A \nabla f. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, the second term in Eq. (35) reads

$$4\alpha \int D_f L_0 f = 4\alpha \int w \frac{\nabla w^T A \nabla f}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} L_0 f + 2\alpha \int F_w^A \nabla f^T A \nabla f + \alpha \int F_w^A L_0 (f^2). \quad (36)$$

From Rellich's identity [Neč12, Eq. (5.2)] we obtain

$$\int (h_w^A)^T \nabla f L_0 f = -\frac{1}{2} \int \nabla f^T B \nabla f, \quad (37)$$

where

$$h_w^A = \frac{w A \nabla w}{\nabla w^T A \nabla w} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \operatorname{div}(h_w^A A) - A D(h_w^A) - D(h_w^A)^T A.$$

From Eq. (36) and (37) we obtain

$$4\alpha \int D_f L_0 f = -2\alpha \int \nabla f^T B \nabla f + 2\alpha \int F_w^A \nabla f^T A \nabla f + \alpha \int F_w^A L_0(f^2).$$

By definition of M_w^A this gives

$$-4\alpha \int D_f L_0 f = 4\alpha \int (\nabla f)^T M_w^A \nabla f - \alpha \int F_w^A L_0(f^2). \quad \square$$

Acknowledgment

Large parts of this work was done during visits of C.R. and M.T. in Zagreb and I.N. in Chemnitz. This exchange was partially financially supported by the DAAD and the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education and Sports through the PPP-grant “Scale-uniform controllability of partial differential equations”. I.N. was also partially supported by HRZZ project grant 9345.

The authors are grateful to Ivan Veselić who introduced us to this research topic, and to Denis Borisov for stimulating discussions and comments received in response to an earlier version of this manuscript. The authors also thank Sergio Vessella for valuable comments and for pointing to the paper [MRV11].

References

- [BK05] J. Bourgain and C. E. Kenig. On localization in the continuous Anderson-Bernoulli model in higher dimension. *Invent. Math.*, 161(2):389–426, 2005.
- [BK13] J. Bourgain and A. Klein. Bounds on the density of states for Schrödinger operators. *Invent. Math.*, 194(1):41–72, 2013.
- [BNR⁺15] D. I. Borisov, I. Nakić, C. Rose, M. Tautenhahn, and I. Veselić. Multiscale unique continuation properties of eigenfunctions. In W. Arendt, R. Chill, and Y. Tomilov, editors, *Operator Semigroups Meet Complex Analysis, Harmonic Analysis and Mathematical Physics*, volume 250 of *Operator Theory: Advances and Applications*, pages 107–118. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2015.
- [BTV14] D. I. Borisov, M. Tautenhahn, and I. Veselić. Equidistribution estimates for eigenfunctions and eigenvalue bounds for random operators. In P. Exner, W. König, and H. Neidhardt, editors, *Mathematical Results in Quantum Mechanics*, pages 89–99. World Scientific, Singapore, 2014.
- [BTV15] D. I. Borisov, M. Tautenhahn, and I. Veselić. Scale-free quantitative unique continuation and equidistribution estimates for solutions of elliptic differential equations. arXiv:1512.06347v1 [math.AP], 2015.
- [Car39] T. Carleman. Sur un problème d’unicité pour les systèmes d’équations aux dérivées partielles à deux variables indépendantes. *Ark. Mat. Astron. Fysik*, 26B(17):1–9, 1939.

- [CZ01] F. Colombini and C. Zuily, editors. *Carleman Estimates and Applications to Uniqueness and Control Theory*, volume 46 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and Their Applications*. Birkhäuser, Boston, 2001.
- [DF88] H. Donnelly and C. Fefferman. Nodal sets for eigenfunctions on Riemannian manifolds. *Invent. Math.*, 93(1):161–183, 1988.
- [EKPV12] L. Escauriaza, C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. Uniqueness properties of solutions to Schrödinger equations. *B. Am. Math. Soc.*, 3(3):415–442, 2012.
- [EV03] L. Escauriaza and S. Vessella. Optimal three cylinder inequalities for solutions to parabolic equations with Lipschitz leading coefficients. In G. Alessandrini and G. Uhlmann, editors, *Inverse Problems: Theory and Applications*, volume 333 of *Contemp. Math.*, pages 79–87. American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2003.
- [Fed96] H. Federer. *Geometric Measure Theory*. Springer, Berlin, 1996.
- [FI96] A. V. Fursikov and O. Y. Imanuvilov. *Controllability of Evolution Equations*, volume 34 of *Suhak kangŭirok*. Seoul National University, Seoul, 1996.
- [Hör89] L. Hörmander. *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I: Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis*. Springer, Berlin, 1989.
- [IK06] A. D. Ionescu and C. E. Kenig. Uniqueness properties of solutions of Schrödinger equations. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 232(1):90–136, 2006.
- [JK85] D. Jerison and C. E. Kenig. Unique continuation and absence of positive eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators. *Ann. Math.*, 121(3):463–494, 1985.
- [Kli13] M. V. Klibanov. Carleman estimates for global uniqueness, stability and numerical methods for coefficient inverse problems. *J. Inverse Ill-Posed Probl.*, 21(4):477–560, 2013.
- [Kli15] M. V. Klibanov. Carleman estimates for the regularization of ill-posed Cauchy problems. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 94:46–74, 2015.
- [KPV03] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega. On unique continuation for nonlinear Schrödinger equation. *Commun. Pur. Appl. Anal.*, 56(9):1247–1262, 2003.
- [KSU11] C. E. Kenig, M. Salo, and G. Uhlmann. Inverse problems for the anisotropic Maxwell equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 157(2):369–419, 2011.
- [Kuk98] I. Kukavica. Quantitative uniqueness for second-order elliptic operators. *Duke Math. J.*, 91(2):225–240, 1998.
- [MRV11] A. Morassi, E. Rosset, and S. Vessella. Sharp three sphere inequality for perturbations of a product of two second order elliptic operators and stability for the Cauchy problem for the anisotropic plate equation. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 261(6):1494–1541, 2011.
- [Neč12] J. Nečas. *Direct Methods in the Theory of Elliptic Equations*. Springer, Berlin, 2012.

- [RL12] J. Le Rousseau and G. Lebeau. On Carleman estimates for elliptic and parabolic operators. Applications to unique continuation and control of parabolic equations. *ESAIM Contr. Op. Ca. Va.*, 18(3):712–747, 2012.
- [RMV13] C. Rojas-Molina and I. Veselić. Scale-free unique continuation estimates and application to random Schrödinger operators. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 320(1):245–274, 2013.
- [Rou12] J. Le Rousseau. Carleman estimates and some applications to control theory. In P. Cannarsa and J.-M. Coron, editors, *Control of Partial Differential Equations*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, pages 207–243. Springer, Berlin, 2012.
- [Zie89] W. P. Ziemer. *Weakly Differentiable Functions*. Springer, New York, 1989.